

REMARKSRequest to Remove Finality of Previous Office Action

As discussed during the interview, the Examiner's position for making the action final was that the Applicant had merely moved subject matter from claim 9 into claim 8 in the Rule 114 amendment filed with the RCE, and had corrected claim dependency matters and grammatical matters in the claims, and that, because of this action, no new substantive issues of patentability were raised by the RCE and Rule 114 amendment. However, this position is incorrect, and the finality is improper. As explained during the interview, claims 20-23 depended from claim 8. By amending claim 8, the scope of claims 20-23 was substantively changed by the amendment. Therefore, the first office action on the RCE should not have been made final. Withdrawal of the finality of the previous office action, and entry and consideration of this amendment is requested.

The amendments

The specification has been amended to correct for a grammatical error. No new matter has been added.

Claim 8 has been amended in a manner substantially as discussed at the interview. Specifically, as recommended at the interview, lines 9-11 now recite "enabling a user to" to make clear that each of these actions is performed. Further, to address definiteness requirements, line 4 has been amended to include the modifier "a" instead of "said". Finally, as was discussed during the interview, the last paragraph of claim 8 has been amended to require that the allowing step allows the first user to switch between contexts without leaving the first user's development environment. Support for this feature is found on page 11 of the application and in Figure 3 of the application. By example, it is shown how a userA could have two contexts: Project A and Project B, in his development environment. By tracking actions of the user, determinations are made as to whether a user is switching to a new context. Since resources can differ from one context to

another, different resources may then be displayed according to the context he or she is working in.

The Rejection

All claims stand rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0018719 to Ruths in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0167344 to Danso.

Ruths and Danso are not related to a method for supporting collaborative development among a team of developers. As noted previously, Ruths shows sharing a resource (e.g., data in a spreadsheet) on three different types of devices (see paragraph [0085]). The parties that are operating the different devices are sharing the resource, but Ruths does not contemplate a user gaining access to other resources in his or her context without having to switch to a different collaboration application (as is required in claim 8). Danso has been cited for its teachings related to communication among various parties (e.g., teacher-student, Internet trading), and Danso describes exchanges of communication protocols at a number of nodes, and derivation of routing paths through the nodes. Danso has been particularly relied upon as showing a discussion thread. Danso does not describe a collaborative venture among different subjects where they are each working in different contexts using different resources.

Based on this, among other deficiencies, Ruths and Danso do not show “capturing a user action in a development environment and determining a context associated with said user action” or “displaying in a graphical user interface display window content of a collaboration space relevant to a current developer context”. Furthermore, in claim 8 as amended, the collaboration space includes a role player and a discussion thread (e.g., as is shown in the viewer 21 of Figure 2). Moreover, claim 8 as amended requires that the first user can switch between contexts without leaving the first user’s development environment. Neither Ruths nor Danso show this feature.

The Examiner has referenced paragraph [0137] of Ruths. It is noted that this paragraph deals with two people sharing the same resource (e.g., an X-ray image), similar

to sharing a spreadsheet (paragraph [0085]). While paragraph [0137] discusses the clinicians being able to share views of the image and to discuss those views orally by VoIP, these actions do not involve role players and discussion threads in a collaboration space, and do not involve gaining access to resources in the context said first user is working in without said first user having to leave said first user's development environment as is required in claim 8. For example, on page 11, at lines 11 et seq., it is described by example how a user can work on different resources (e.g., documents) which can be present in different contexts without leaving a user's development environment (e.g., a user working on a document in project B after having started operations in project A). In this scenario, the user gains access to different resources for supporting the collaboration. Ruths does not contemplate adding or deleting a resource and a relationship to or from said context.

In view of the above, claims 8, 10, 14, and 20-23 are now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date is requested.

Applicants hereby make a written conditional petition for extension of time, if required. Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Applicants' Deposit Account No. 50-0510 (IBM Corporation).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael E. Whitham
Registration No. 32,635

Whitham, Curtis Christofferson & Cook, P.C.
11491 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 340
Reston, Virginia 20190
Tel. (703) 787-9400
Fax. (703) 787-7557

Customer No: 30743